

REMARKS

By the foregoing Amendment, Claims 1, 13 and 27 have been amended, and Claims 2 and 15 have been cancelled. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 7-10, 13-17, 20-23, 27, 28 and 31-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) on the grounds of anticipation by Briles. In Briles, the nut has a base portion with pressure control gates in the form of overflow grooves or channels 52, through which the sealing material can flow when the sealing material is compressed. The Examiner asserted that the nut and captive washer of Briles form a unitary collar, and that the "collar" of Briles is read to be inclusive of both the nut body 12 and the captive washer 14. However, the Examiner also acknowledged that the captive washer may not be employed as part of the nut assembly, as disclosed in Briles at column 9, lines 17-18, so that the captive washer is not unitary with the nut. Briles further discloses at column 5, lines 20-23, that when it is employed, the washer 14 is freely rotatable relative to the nut, so that even when the captive washer is employed, the captive washer is clearly not unitary with the nut. Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter from Claim 2, and recites "said unitary, hollow, generally cylindrical swage collar adapted to be disposed over the shaft of the fastener ... having ... a base portion ... having a flat even surface adapted to contact said assembly of workpieces." Claims 13 and 27 have been similarly amended. Support for the amendment reciting that the base portion has a flat even surface can be found in the description as a whole and in Figs. 1-6C. It is

respectfully submitted that Briles does not teach, disclose or suggest a unitary, hollow, generally cylindrical swage collar adapted to be disposed over the shaft of a fastener and having a base portion having a flat even surface adapted to contact an assembly of workpieces, as is claimed, that Claims 1-4, 7-10, 13-17, 20-23, 27, 28 and 31-35 are novel and inventive over Briles. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claims 1-4, 7-10, 13-17, 20-23, 27, 28 and 31-35 on the grounds of anticipation by Briles should be withdrawn.

Claims 27-28, 31, 33 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) on the grounds of obviousness from Briles in view of Armour. Claim 27 recites "a generally cylindrical unitary collar, ... the base portion having a flat even surface adapted to contact said assembly of workpieces." Armour discloses a collar having an annular internal taper 23 as described at column 2, lines 16-20 and shown in Fig. 1. As noted above, in Briles the nut has a base portion with overflow grooves or channels. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Briles and Armour do not teach, disclose or suggest a unitary, hollow, generally cylindrical swage collar adapted to be disposed over the shaft of a fastener and having a base portion having a flat even surface adapted to contact an assembly of workpieces, as is claimed. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 27-28, 31, 33 and 34 are novel and inventive over Briles and Armour, and that the rejection of Claims 27-28, 31, 33 and 34 on the grounds of obviousness from Briles in view of Armour should be withdrawn.

Claims 5, 6, 18, 19, 39 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) on the grounds of obviousness from Briles alone, or Briles in view of Armour, and further in

view of Rath, which was cited as disclosing a collar made of aluminum or titanium.

There is no claim 39 currently on file. Rath discloses a collar having longitudinally extending fins or ribs 24 extending the length of the bore of the collar to move into the root of the thread of the pin to block any leak path along the groove, which would interfere with insertion of an internal sealing insert in the collar, as claimed, so that it is respectfully submitted that Rath is inapposite. Claims 5 and 6 depend from Claim 1, Claims 18 and 19 depend from Claim 13, and Claims 29 and 30 depend from Claim 27. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Briles, Armour, and Rath do not teach, disclose or suggest tightly a unitary, hollow, generally cylindrical swage collar adapted to be disposed over the shaft of a fastener and having a base portion having a flat even surface adapted to contact an assembly of workpieces, as is claimed. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 5, 6, 18, 19, 29 and 30 are novel and inventive over Briles, Armour, and Rath, and that the rejection of Claims 5, 6, 18, 19, 29 and 30 on the grounds of obviousness from Briles in view of Armour and further in view of Rath should be withdrawn.

Claims 11, 12, 24 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) on the grounds of obviousness from Briles, further in view of Breed, which was cited as disclosing a rounded groove and flange. Claims 11 and 12 depend from Claim 1, and Claims 24 and 25 depend from Claim 13. Claims 1 and 13 recite an internal sealing insert to be tightly sealed in engagement with the fastener. At column 4, lines 34-41, Breed teaches that the sealing element does not project inwardly of the central bore and consequently insures that jamming of the sealing element between the threads of the stem and the nut will not

occur. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that Breed is inapposite, and that Briles and Breed do not teach, disclose or suggest tightly a unitary, hollow, generally cylindrical swage collar adapted to be disposed over the shaft of a fastener and having a base portion having a flat even surface adapted to contact an assembly of workpieces, with an internal sealing insert tightly sealed entirely in the swage collar in engagement with the fastener, as is claimed. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 11, 12, 24 and 25 are novel and inventive over Briles and Breed, and that the rejection of Claims 11, 12, 24 and 25 on the grounds of obviousness from Briles in view of Breed should be withdrawn.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application should now be in condition for allowance, and an early favorable action in this regard is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FULWIDER PATTON LEE & UTECHT, LLP

By:

James W. Paul
Reg. No. 29,967

JWP/rvw

Encls.:Return Postcard

Howard Hughes Center
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90045
Telephone: (310) 824-5555
Facsimile: (310) 824-9696
Customer No. 24201
88384.1